

1 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332)
2 United States Attorney

3 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CSBN 163173)
4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
6 Assistant United States Attorney

7 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
8 San Jose, California 95113
9 Telephone: (408) 535-5036
10 FAX: (408) 535-5066
11 jennifer.a.griffith@usdoj.gov

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff

13
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 SAN JOSE DIVISION

17 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 08-00041 RS
18 Plaintiff,)
19 v.) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
20 JOHN HENRY BRUNO,) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
21 Defendant.) SAN JOSE VENUE

22 On May 15, 2008, the parties in the above-captioned case appeared before the Court for a
23 status hearing. Assistant Federal Public Defender Nicholas P. Humy explained to the Court the
24 history of the case, including the defendant's personal circumstances that resulted in the issuance
25 of a bench warrant. The warrant has since been vacated. The parties then jointly requested that a
26 change of plea hearing be scheduled before the Honorable Judge Seeborg on June 19, 2008 at
27 9:30 a.m. Assistant United States Attorney Susan Knight requested an exclusion of time under
28 the Speedy Trial Act from May 15, 2008 through June 19, 2008. The undersigned parties agree
and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective

1 preparation of counsel.

2 SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

4 DATED: 5/15/08

/s/
5 SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney

6 DATED: 5/15/08

/s/
7 NICHOLAS P. HUMY
8 Assistant Federal Public Defender

9

10 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
11 under the Speedy Trial Act from May 15, 2008 to June 19, 2008. The Court finds, based on the
12 aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance
13 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant
14 the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective
15 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage
16 of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18
17 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

18 SO ORDERED.

19

20 DATED: _____

21 PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL
United States Magistrate Judge

22

23

24

25

26

27

28